EXHIBIT F

21 MC 102 In Re: World Trade Center Lower Manhattan Disaster Site Litigation

Summary of Information From Short Form "Check Off" Complaints

			ſ		ı		I
∢	8	S	2	u	-		7 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 1
No.	Plaintiff	Docket No.	Docket No. Alleges Work for Tully or	Work for Non-"Tully" Companies	Job Title	Work Sites Other than "WTC Site" as Defined in CMO 3	Alleges Work at DB Building
			Named Sub- Contractors				other than from 1/8/02 to 7/1/02
~	Acosta, Byron	07cv1552	No	LVI Environmental Services, Inc	Handler		Yes
2	Adriano, Luis	07cv4445	No	ETS Contracting and PAL	Asbestos handler	1 Liberty Plaza; Post Office	Yes
က	Agudelo, Gladys 07cv4446	07cv4446	No O	Comprehensive Environmental Asbestos cleaner	Asbestos cleaner	1 Federal Plaza; 100 Church Street, 70 Pine Street, 75 Park Place; High School of Economics and Finance	NO V
4	Ali Enricine	07cv1554	S	PAL Environmental Safety	Supervisor	1 Liberty Plaza	Yes
L ro	Allivar, Raul	-	N _O	PAL Environmental Safety	Handler	150 Broadway; 1 Liberty Plaza; Post Office (90 Church Street)	Yes
9	Alvarez, Maria	05cv10135 No	0	Kiss Construction and PAL	Handler	90 Trinity Place; High School of Economics & Finance; Post Office; Stuyvesant High School	Yes
7	Alvarracin, Jose 07cv1556	07cv1556	ON.	Pinnacle Environment	Asbestos handler	Post Office	Yes
œ	Arsenault, Kirk	04cv5338	Yes: Manfort Brothers	None	Burner		Yes
တ	Ascencio, Ivan	07cv1460	o N	ETS Contracting	Laborer- asbestos	High School of Economics & Finance	Yes
10	Atiencia, Marcelo	07cv1562	No	LVI Environmental Services, Inc.	Handler	Stuyvesant High School	Yes
7	Bailon, Peter	07cv5336	N _O	Pinnacle Environmental Corp.	Supervisor	Post Office	Yes
12	Barahona, Jose	07cv5550	°Z	Pinnacle Environmental Corp. and Trade Winds Environmental Restoration	Handler	100 Church Street	Yes
13	Betancourt, Hector	07cv4453	No No	ETS Contracting, Inc. and PAL Environmental Safety	Handler	1 Liberty Plaza	Yes
4	Burgos, Leopoldo	07cv1473	ON O	PAL Environmental Safety	Handler		Yes

21 MC 102 In Re: World Trade Center Lower Manhattan Disaster Site Litigation

Summary of Information From Short Form "Check Off" Complaints

∢	B	ပ	۵	Ш	L	၅	I.
Š	Plaintiff	Docket No.	Docket No. Alleges Work for Tully or Named Sub-	Work for Non-"Tully" Companies	Job Title	Work Sites Other than "WTC Site" as Defined in CMO 3	Alleges Work at DB Building other than from
			Contractors				1/8/02 to 7/1/02
15	Caguana, Manuel	06cv11968	06cv11968 Yes: EROC	None	Laborer		Yes
16		07cv1575	N _O	PAL Environmental Safety	Shop steward		Yes
17	Calle, Wilson	07cv1578	No	Pinnacle Environment	Asbestos handler	Post Office	Yes
8	Campoverde,	07cv5280	S S	PAL Environmental Safety	Hander	Post Office	Yes
9		07cv4459	No.	Pinnacle Environment	Asbestos handler		Yes
20		07cv1580	ON.	PAL Environmental Safety	Handler	Millenium Hilton Hotel	Yes
7		05cv1718	No No	Branch	Handler		Yes
22		07cv1589	o N	oestos	Asbestos handler	Post Office	Yes
23	Cintron, Yolanda	06cv5631	0 N	CES	Asbestos handler	160 Water Street; Stuyvesant High School Yes	Yes
24		. 07cv5394	S O	Galt John Corp.	Handler		Yes
25	Cortijo, Lidia	07cv317	O Z	LVI Environmental Services, Inc., PAL Environmental Safety and Pinnacle Environmental Corp.	None	101 Barclay Street; 4 Albany Street; Hudson View East	Yes
26	Criollo, Nancy	07cv4462	o _N	PAL Environmental Safety	Cleaner	1 Liberty Plaza	Yes
27		07cv1602	ON.	Asbestos Lead and Hazardous Asbestos Materials Laborers handler	Asbestos handler	Post Office; Equitable Building	Yes
78	Drake, Jesse	07cv5353	No	Nastasi Eurotech	Carpenter		Yes

21 MC 102 In Re: World Trade Center Lower Manhattan Disaster Site Litigation

Summary of Information From Short Form "Check Off" Complaints

	٥		c	4	L	တ	I
۲	٥	اد			t	MATCHER OFFICE	Allogoe Mork of
No.	No. Plaintiff	Docket No.	Docket No. Alleges Work for Tully or	Work for Non-"Tully" Companies	Job Lite	Work Sites Other than "Wild Site as Defined in CMO 3	Alleges work at DB Building
			Named Sub- Contractors				other than from 1/8/02 to 7/1/02
29	Drozdz, Stanislaw	06cv14620		Pinnacle, Trade Winds, Trio Asbestos	Asbestos handler	101 Barclay Street; 111 Wall Street; 140 Broadway; 70 Pine Street; Gillespi Building; Hudson View East, Parc Place; Stuyvesant High School	Yes
30	Duarte, Inerva	07cv1603	ON.	Safeway Construction, Inc. and None Safeway Environmental Corp.	None		Yes
34	Dutan, Elvia	07cv1606	o N	Pinnacle Environment	Office cleaner/ handler	Post Office	Yes
32	Encalada, Jorge	07cv1607	O _N	PAL Environmental Safety and Pinnacle Environmental Safety	Handler		Yes
33	Franco Luis	07cv4466	S N	PAL Environmental Safety	Handler		Not Provided
<u> </u>	Frelas, Janina	07cv1612	o Z	ETS Contracting, Inc. and Safeway Environmental Corp.	Asbestos handler and handler	233 Broadway	, Kes
35	Gallardo,	07cv5290	N _O	Pinnacle Environmental Corp.	Handler		No No
36	Garcia, Viviana	07cv1617	° Z	Comprehensive Environmental Asbestos handler	Asbestos handler	Jacob K. Javits Federal Building	Yes
37	Gaspar, Peter	05cv10739	Q N	ETS Contracting, PAL, Pinnacle	Supervisor and asbestos	Post Office	Yes
e e	Gawin, Leonard	07cv1619	O Z	PAL Environmental Safety, Safeway Environmental Corp., and Trade Winds Environmental Restoration	Asbestos handler	101 Barclay Street, 170 Broadway; 76 Varick Street, 95 Maiden Lane	, kes
39	Giamo, Samuel T.	06cv11676	o _Z	FDNY	Firefighter		Yes

21 MC 102 In Re: World Trade Center Lower Manhattan Disaster Site Litigation

Summary of Information From Short Form "Check Off" Complaints

0	ر	_	Ш	14	ŋ	I
	٥	<u>ן</u>			in the charm in the	A 11 147 4
	Docket No.	Docket No. Alleges Work for Tully or Named Sub-	Work for Non-"Tully" Companies	Job Title	Work Sites Other than "WTC Site" as Defined in CMO 3	Alleges Work at DB Building other than from
Giraldo, Hitien	07cv5554	Contractors No	PAL Environmental Safety	Handler		Yes
E. Gualpa, Rosa	07cv4472	No	Pinnacle Environmental Corp.	Asbestos cleaning	170 Broadway	Yes
	07cv5556	No	Branch	Asbestos worker		Yes
Nidia	Hernando, Nidia 07cv4473	No.	Pinnacle Environment	Handler asbestos		Yes
Hurtado, Julio	07cv5295	0 V	Kiss Construction, Inc., LBI- ABAS, Locat 78, PAL Environmental Safety, Pinnacle Environmental Corp.	Not Provided	63 Wall Street; 90 Chambers Street; P.S. 234 Independence School; West Street Building	Yes
Idrovo Manuel	07cv1628	02	Local 78	Cleaner	Post Office	Yes
Idrovo, Edgar	07cv1627	No.	Pinnacle Environment	Asbestos cleaner		Yes
	07cv1629	S.	LVI Environmental Services, inc.	Handler	Post Office; West Street Building	Yes
Jablonski, Jozef	07cv1630	ON.	PAL Environmental Safety and Trade Winds Environmenal Restoration	Asbestos handler	Post Office	Yes
lonas	Jaramillo, Jonas 06cv14746 No	O _N	Branch, PAL Environmental Asbestt Safety, Pinnacle Environmental handler Corp., Trade Winds Environmental Rest.	Asbestos handler	100 Church Street	Yes
Karus, Marian	07cv1635	o Z	LVI Environmental Services, Inc., PAL Environmental Safety, and Pinnacle Environmental Corp.	Asbestos handler and handler	P.S. 89	Yes

21 MC 102 In Re: World Trade Center Lower Manhattan Disaster Site Litigation

Summary of Information From Short Form "Check Off" Complaints

-	6	C		u	ц	ဗ	I
4	2	ر					Allocate Morb of
O	Plaintiff	Docket No.	Docket No. Alleges Work for Tully or Named Sub- Contractors	Work for Non-"Tully" Companies	Job Title	Work Sites Other than "WIC Site" as Defined in CMO 3	Alleges work at DB Building other than from 1/8/02 to 7/1/02
51	Kosowski, Edward	07cv5299	OZ.	PAL Environmental Safety, and Asbestos Trade Winds Environmental handler Rest.	Asbestos handler	100 Church Street; 101 Barclay Street; 160 Water Street; 1 Liberty Plaza; Post Office; P.S. 234 Independence School	Yes
52	Lascano, Ana	05cv9333	S O	PAL Environmental	Cleaner	150 Broadway; 1 Liberty Plaza; Post Office	Yes
53	Lasica, Andrzej	07cv4480	NO.	PAL Environmental Safety, Pinnacle Environmental Corp.	Asbestos handler	High School of Economics & Finance; Hudson View East; Sytuvesant High School	Yes
2	I onic Carlos	06cv10045	S	CES	Supervisor		Yes
55		07cv4481		PAR Environmental Corp., and Not Pinnacle Environmental Corp. Pro	Not Provided	90 Trinity Place; High School of Economics & Finance; Post Office; P.S. 234 Independence School	o Z
56	Leon, Cesar	07cv63	No	Safeway Environmental Corp.	Handler		Yes
57	l oia Wilmo	07cv4482	No	Pinnacle Environment	Handler		Yes
28	Lucero,	07cv5366	No	Pinnacle Environmenal Corp.	Handler	55 Water Street; Post Office	Yes
59	Medina, Rosa	07cv4491	N _O	ТВР	To be supplied	Post Office	Yes
90	Melendez, Maria	07cv5397	No No	PAL Environmental Safety	Handler		Yes
61	Mendez, Juan	07cv1664	No N	Local 78	Asbestos handler	One Liberty Plaza	Yes
62	Merchan, Carlos	07cv1665	NO NO	Pinnacle Environment Corp.	Asbestos handler		Yes
63	Mora, Eugenio	06cv13168	No	PAL Environmental Safety	Cleaner	100 Church Street, Post Office, Stuyvesant High School	Yes
9	Morales, Tatiana 07cv5370	07cv5370	No	Pinnacle Environment Corp.	Asbestos handler	Post Office	Yes

21 MC 102 In Re: World Trade Center Lower Manhattan Disaster Site Litigation

Summary of Information From Short Form "Check Off" Complaints

		ر	 	u	ш	ဗ	Ŧ
מ	ر	_]	5				A 11 14/ 1 4
No. Plaintiff Docket No. Alleges Work for Tully or Named Sub-	Docket No. All for	A o s	Alleges Work for Tully or Named Sub-	Work for Non-"Tully" Companies	Job Title	Work Sites Other than "WTC Site" as Defined in CMO 3	Alleges work at DB Building other than from 1/8/02 to 7/1/02
Moreno, Sandra 07cv1670 No		S Z	Contractors	LVI Environmental Services,	Not		Yes
Naranjo, Luis 05cv10738 No				Local 78, LVI Environmental Services, Inc., PAL	Cleaner and	Hudson View East; 1 Liberty Plaza; Post Office; Stuyvesant High School	Yes
	· · · ·			Environmental Safety, Pinnacle cleaner/ Environmental handler	cleaner/ asbestos handler		
Naranjo, Walter 07cv4496 No	1	2		Pinnacle Environment	Cleaner	25 Broadway, 90 Trinity Place; High School of Economics and Finance; Hudson View East; P.S. 234 Independence School; Stuyvesant High School	Yes
Negrete Oscar 07cv5371 No	i	2		PAL Environmental Safety	Handler	233 Broadway	Yes
n 07cv5374	i	2		_	Volunteer		To be provided
Palaguachi, 07cv1680 No		2		Branch	Asbestos cleaner		Yes
Reynolds, David 07cv3446 No	:	2	<u> </u> 	Nastasi Eurotech	Carpenter	10 Liberty Street; American Stock Exchange; West Street Building	Yes
Rhoden, Marcel 07cv5311 No		Š		Site Safety, LLC	Safety manager		Yes
Riera, Maximo 07cv1519 No		Š		Comprehensive Environmental Handler	Handler		Yes
Rodas, Patricio 07cv1694 No	!	ž		Pinnacle Environmental Corp.	Handler	Post Office	Yes
Rojas, Jaime 07cv4511 No		Ž		Pinnacle Environmental Corp.	Asbestos handler	100 Church Street; Millenium Hilton Hotel; Yes Post Office	Yes

In Re. World Trade Center Lower Manhattan Disaster Site Litigation 21 MC 102

Summary of Information From Short Form "Check Off" Complaints

٩	œ	ပ	Q	Ш	ш	9	Ŧ
نہ ا	Plaintiff	Docket No.	Work or Sub- tors	Work for Non-"Tully" Companies	Job Title	Work Sites Other than "WTC Site" as Defined in CMO 3	Alleges Work at DB Building other than from 1/8/02 to 7/1/02
9/	Romaniuk, Mieczyslaw	07cv5316	o Z	LVI Environmental Services, Inc., PAL Environmental Safety, Pinnacle Environmental Corp., Safeway	Asbestos handler	1 Federal Plaza; 1 Wall Street; 100 Church Street; High School of Economics and Finance; Hudson View East	Yes
77	Salazar, Victor	07cv4512	No	Pinnacle Environmental Corp.	Handler	Hudson View East	Yes
78	Sanchez, Rosa	06cv12488	No.	ТВР	ТВР		Yes
79	Sanchez, Edilberto		No O	PAL Environmental Safety	Asbestos handler		Yes
8	Santamaria, Emanuel	07cv1528	Q.	PAL Environmental Safety	Handler		Yes
81	Sarmiento, Galo 07cv1529	07cv1529	o _N	PAL Environmental Safety	Handler	20 Broad Street; 55 Water Street, West Street Building	Yes
82	Sarmiento, Edwin	07cv4515	0 2	Kiss Construction, Inc.	Asbestos handler	160 Water Street 24 Broadway; 63 Wall Street; 90 Trinity Place; High School of Economics and Finance (100 Trinity Place); Hudson View East; 1 Liberty Plaza; Post Office; Stuyvesant High School; P.S. 234 Independence School	, ,
83	Serrano, Theresa	05cv8937	No	PAL Environmental Safety	Handler		Yes
28	Siguencia, Raul	07cv1533	ON	Pinnacle Enviromenal Corp.	Handler		Yes
85	Suarez, Felipe	07cv1707	No	Pinnacle Enviromenal Corp.	Asbestos handler		Yes
98	Sumba, Samuel	07cv1710	ON.	Pinnacle Enviromenal Corp.	Handler	63 Wall Street, Hudson View East, Stuyvesant High School, The Equitable Building	Yes
87	Tamayo, Pedro	07cv1538	No	Pinnacle Enviromenal Corp.	Cleaner	101 Barclay Street	Yes

In Re. World Trade Center Lower Manhattan Disaster Site Litigation

Summary of Information From Short Form "Check Off" Complaints

۵	œ	S	O	ш	L.	9	I
皇	Plaintiff	Docket No.	Docket No. Alleges Work	Work for Non-"Tully" Companies	Job Title	Work Sites Other than "WTC Site" as Defined in CMO 3	Alleges Work at DB Building
			Named Sub- Contractors				other than from 1/8/02 to 7/1/02
88	Teham, Nicholas 07cv5564		ON.	Regional Scaffolding	Carpenter		Yes
68	Tenezaca, Julia	07cv1714	No	Pinnacle Enviromenal Corp.	Handler		Yes
06	Teran, Cesareo	07cv5389	No ON	Comprehensive Environmental Handler	l Handler		Yes
91	Thorpe, Jeanne	07cv1715	No	PAL Environmental Safety	Asbestos handler	Trinity Church	Yes
92	Valencia, Carlos 07cv5324 A.	07cv5324	NO N	Maxons Restoration, Inc.	Cleaner	100 Church Street; 100 Gateway Plaza; 101 Barclay Street; 200 Gateway Plaza; 400 Gateway Plaza	Yes
93	Vasquez, Rommel	07cv1543	o N	PAL Environmental Safety	Handler	Stuyvesant High School	Yes
94	Vazquez, Kattia	07cv1722	ON ON	PAL Environmental Safety	Asbestos handler	Post Office	Yes
95	Vega, Severo	07cv4521	<u>8</u>	PAL Environmental Safety	Handler	1 Liberty Plaza	Yes
96	Villarroel,	07cv1546	ON O	PAL Environmental Safety	Handler	Stuyvesant High School	Yes
97	Villarruel, Kleber 06cv13703	- 06cv13703	No	PAL Environmental Safety	Foreman	1 Liberty Plaza	Yes
86	Walsh, Kevin	06cv12608	No	Nastasi Eurotech	Carpenter		Yes
66	Waniurski, Robert		O _N	LVI Environmental Services, Inc., PAL Environmental Safety, and Pinnacle Environmental Corp.	Asbestos handler	30 Rockefeller Plaza	Yes
100	Watson, Ancil	07cv5391	Yes: Tulley's [sic] Construction Company	None	Laborer		Yes
101	Wragg, Clarence 06cv8125	, 06cv8125	ON O	Trade Winds Environmental Restoration	Asbestos worker		Yes

EXHIBIT G

```
76FVWORC.TXT
```

76FVWORC Conference UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

IN RE: WORLD TRADE CENTER

21 MC 102 (AKH) LOWER MANHATTAN DISASTER

SITE LITIGATION

____X

New York, N.Y. June 15, 2007 1:05 p.m.

1

2

Before:

1

1223

3

122334455667

HON. ALVIN K. HELLERSTEIN,

District Judge

APPEARANCES

WORBY GRONER EDELMAN & NAPOLI BERN LLP

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

WILLIAM H. GRONER MARC J. BERN WILLIAM J. DUBANEVICH

-ANDGREGORY J. CANNATA & ASSOCIATES
BY: GREGORY J. CANNATA

-AND-

ROBERT A. GROCHOW PC BY: ROBERT A. GROCHOW

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

76FVWORC

Conference

APPEARANCES (cont'd.)

PATTON BOGGS LLP

Attorneys for Defendant City of New York JAMES E. TYRRELL, JR.

JOSEPH E. HOPKINS

FLEMMING ZUŁACK WILLIAMSON ZAUDERER LLP Attorneys for Defendant Silverstein Properties, Inc. BY: THOMAS A. EGAN

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
Attorneys for Defendant Verizon New York
BY: LEE ANN STEVENSON

STERN TANNENBAUM & BELL LLP

Page 1

D

```
76FVWORC.TXT
                    worked out, Napoli Bern firm needs to perform a check-off complaint which is commensurate with the one that was finalized by liaison counsel for plaintiffs in the 102 docket.

MR. CANNATA: Your Honor, part of the difficulty that we have is is that the Court's order required the complaints to be filed before they were finalized. And that was part of the
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
                     difficulty.
                    However, I understand that there are no firemen and policemen plaintiffs in this docket. And if you recall the last conference, we addressed this issue and you ordered that the 205(e) claims should be taken out. And that's what we did. And as far as I know, there aren't any --
THE COURT: So if they are still in, I guess they'll
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
                     be fixed up.
                     MR. CANNATA: It's not a problem, Judge. There are no plaintiffs that are claiming that basis for a suit.

THE COURT: Mr. Hopkins. Again, I don't have a basis to resolve that. There's a substantive point here. The point
 19
 20
                     is that a fireman and a policeman are not allowed to sue the City, I guess, for damages where they can recover the analog to workmen's compensation. That's the point, isn't it?
 Žĺ
 23
                                                     MR. CANNATA: No, Judge, that's incorrect. THE COURT: Incorrect.
 24
                                                                           SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
                                                                                                               (212) 805-0300
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       14
                     76FVWORC

Conference

MR. CANNATA: You're incorrect by that. A fireman and policeman can sue the City, but they have to allege a specific violation of law, a rule. But as far as I know, there are no plaintiffs -- they do have some. I'm being told they do have a couple. So, Judge, they have to straighten that out.

THE COURT: What's the situation?
     1234
     5
6
7
                      MR. DUBANEVICH: Your Honor, William J. Dubanevich.
We do have firefighters and police officers who are in the 102
classification. And that is why we had to allege violations of
     89
  10
                       the General Municipal Law.
                       THE COURT: So what do you want me to do, Mr. Hopkins?
MR. HOPKINS: Well, after all the Sturm und Drang that
we've had to get to this point to try to finalize pleadings, we
now have master complaint filed which does not include
  11
12
13
14
15
                        allegations regarding General Municipal Law.
                      allegations regarding General Municipal Law.

We have check-off complaints from Cannata and Grochow that don't make reference to that because it's not there. But now, and really, I think, for the first time we're hearing from the Napoli Worby Groner firm that they do have allegations to make under those provisions, and they are not in the master complaint. So their check-off complaint refers back to the master complaint that doesn't contain those types of claims.

THE COURT: So the first assertion of the claim is the check-off complaint, and presumably you're going to move to dismiss them because of the issue of limitations.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300
   16
17
18
19
   20
21
22
   23
24
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         15
                                                                                                                 Conference
                        76FVWORC
                                                        MR. HOPKINS: Undoubtedly. And I'm sure other
                        substantive reasons, as well.

THE COURT: Like what? Just to give me a heads-up.

MR. HOPKINS: I've not looked at the check-off
complaints, so I can't speak to whatever the clients are. B
```

as to whether that is a proper vehicle for whoever these people -- these plaintiffs may be; whether they can rely upon Page 7

0

D

```
76FVWORC.TXT
                    this provision in the General Municipal Law to make such a claim or not. It goes beyond any type of statute-type issue.

THE COURT: I'm not familiar with the law. I don't
10
                   THE COURT: I'm not familiar with the law. I don't know what it is. But I'll take the statement from Mr. Cannata as expressing the law that if the City has violated a law that firemen and policemen can sue. You know, all this makes my head kind of swim. And I guess it begs the definition of what's involved in the 102 and later the 103 cases.

Forgetting about the technical definition of the World Trade Center, the way I looked at this is that 100 were the cases that were focused mainly against the City, because the Department of Design and Construction took the lead in the cleanup of the World Trade Center.

102 were cases where there were private or public
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
                                                    102 were cases where there were private or public
                     homeowners independent of the Department of Design and
                    Correction, to the Department of Design and Construction.

And 103 is where plaintiffs did some work under the jurisdiction of the DDC and other work under the jurisdiction
23
                                                                          SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   16
                     76FVWORC
                                                                                                             Conference
                     of private and public property owners. That's how I looked at it. I don't know if that's realistic or not.

MR. CANNATA: Your Honor, that's our position, as the Court just expressed. However, when you issued the order for
    2
 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
                     103, we believe you made an error, and you went to the earlier definition, the 100 definition, of what the world Trade Center
                      site was.
                                                     THE COURT: I did? MR. CANNATA: You inadvertently did that. And you did
                      that --
                     THE COURT: It was the only definition that was at hand. Let me just tell you this: I thought, and let me expose my thinking so that if it's wrong, I want to know it's wrong.

I thought that DDC was in control of the cleanup
                    operations with regard to all the property identified in that first order. And I think I took that definition from the Victims Compensation Fund. I don't remember exactly where I took it from, but I think I took it from there. And that may be the cause of the problem, I don't know. And I don't know what is feasible here.
 16
17
 18
19
20
21
22
                     MR. CANNATA: Well, the practical effect of it is, Judge, that by using the definition from 100 that you used that was made before 102 was created, you've essentially put almost all of the plaintiffs from 102 back into the 100 case and thus,
 23
24
                      the 103 case.
                                                                           SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     17
                       76FVWORC
                                                                                                               Conference
                                                       THE COURT: I didn't intend that.
                     THE COURT: I didn't intend that.

MR. CANNATA: I know you didn't intend it, Judge. But
I'm just telling you, for example, with our cases, I have our
45 or so plaintiffs, we would end up with about 35 of them into
103, and only a handful, eight or nine or ten, in 102. And I
don't think that's what the Court intended.

THE COURT: No, it's not what I intended. I also
raised the issue of the lead counsel issues with regard to 102
and 103. Because it was my conception that the 102 case had
involved lawsuits against others in the City through DDC. And
therefore, I thought it not particularly appropriate that the
same plaintiffs' lawyers are the same defendants' lawyers be
```

Page 8

0

0

10 11 12

```
76FVWORC.TXT
             functioning on 102. Mr. Tyrrell.
MR. TYRRELL:
13
14
                                                             And I've never really resolved that issue.
             MR. TYRRELL: Your Honor, I'd like to jump an issue back, as we've moved ahead to the issue of whether there should
15
16
             be broader representation at the level of the liaison, not
lead, but liaison counsel. I'd like to speak to that later,
but I'd like to respond to Mr. Cannata's point.
17
18
19
20
21
             We have been operating for more than two years now with a particular definition that was born in the 100 docket
             that your Honor created as to what was the geographic area, the 16 acres covered by that docket. But it is not true when you created 102, you'll remember we objected to it at that time, we said, Don't bother breaking them up; keep them altogether.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300
22
23
24
25
                                                                                                                                                              18
              76FVWORC
                                                                       Conference
             we're over that. But when you created 102, you took the reciprocal of that definition; you said other things --
             THE COURT: That's right.

MR. TYRRELL: -- in that 16 acres.

THE COURT: That's right.

MR. TYRRELL: Now, that made great sense. Because whether the claim occurred in lower Manhattan or occurred, as
 3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
              Mr. Cannata says, here in this courthouse, and frankly, I think the only one in this courthouse who possibly got sick is your Honor for working too hard on the case. But that's a different
              kind of claim.
                                    THE COURT: I need a remedy.
              (Laughter)
MR. TYRRELL: You need a remedy. I think it's more
than over-the-counter, your Honor. If we go back now and
change, so I'm now focused exactly on that issue —
THE COURT: My wife said retire. I said the case will
 13
14
15
16
17
 18
19
20
               follow me.
                                    (Laughter)
               MR. TYRRELL: If we go there now, okay, we're going to ditch all of the definitions and organizational stuff that we
 21
22
23
              had. But then when you look at what Mr. Cannata proposes in his letter, which is something that is supposed to be better, and of course, you said nobody's substantive rights is going to be affected by this. This is just to help get it organized.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300
  24
                                                                                                                                                                19
                                                                        Conference
               76FVWORC
                                    His definition will turn on whether the City of New
  1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
               York is a defendant in each case. That makes no sense
               whatsoever.
                                    So in his definition, someone who worked on the pile
               and sued only Tully, it would no longer be a 100 case, because the City of New York would have to be in it, according to his
                proposed
                                    THE COURT: If someone worked on the pile and worked
                for Tully --
                                    MR. TYRRELL: And didn't sue New York, too, it
               wouldn't any longer be a 100 case.

THE COURT: Well, who would he sue?

MR. TYRRELL: I don't know. It's amiss.

MR. CANNATA: I didn't say that, Judge.

MR. TYRRELL: We don't need to change this.

MR. CANNATA: Judge, excuse me. I didn't say that in

my letter. I said outside on the mound.
   16
```

Page 9

0

П

```
76FVWORC.TXT
            THE COURT: Stop. Stop. what's the justification of having a different collection of cases in 102 from what I have in 100? I'll answer it. It's because it's a different
19
20
21
22
             defendant.
            The City, except as an owner of property, is not involved. The violations alleged of the labor law were by the managers and owners of the specific properties. I mean, folks, that's what I had in mind.
23
24
25
                                             SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
                                                                   (212) 805-0300
                                                                                                                                                     20
            76FVWORC
                                                                  Conference
            MR. TYRRELL: And your Hono suggesting we change that.
THE COURT: The definition.
  1
2
3
                                                            And your Honor, at this point we're not
            MR. TYRRELL: It is Mr. Cannata who is suggesting --
THE COURT: My definition.
MR. TYRRELL: -- that your definition be changed. So
now if someone worked, and let's take the Deutsche Bank
  4 5
 6
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23
            building as an example. It was under the control, we believe, of the DBS for the cleanup. It was completely -- it wasn't not
            banned, it was destroyed.
                                THE COURT: DBS?
                                MR. TYRRELL: I'm sorry, Department of Design and
            Construction.
                                THE COURT: I don't think sanitation was involved.
            MR. TYRRELL: Right. Now, that building was never reoccupied, okay. So as to that building, if you now took his definition and transferred that out because it was originally a
            private building, we would be creating yet more confusion.

THE COURT: I think DDC was involved with Deutsche
            Bank.
            MR. TYRRELL: That's why it should stay in 100.
THE COURT: That's why Verizon is in 100 also.
MR. TYRRELL: And you've already ruled on those applications as to Verizon, and I know Verizon's counsel wants to speak to that. But if you followed Mr. Cannata's suggestion SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
(212) 805-0300
24
25
                                                                                                                                                     21
             76FVWORC
                                                                  Conference
            now, all of the Verizon cases and the Verizon building would move to the 102 docket.

THE COURT: I've taken the position throughout that
            substantive rights should not be affected by how I categorize the case. Because I never really felt confident in my definitions. And I didn't want substantive rights to be affected by it.
  5
6
7
            It was my impression that Deutsche Bank, which is across the street from is it One or Two World Trade Center, was treated like it was part of the World Trade Center in terms of
10
             the cleanup operations. But the buildings on Rector Street, to draw an example, two blocks away, three blocks away, I don't remember exactly, should not be in the same category as the
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
             World Trade Center.
            Now, you ask what about the buildings in between, the church, for example, across the street, the other way to the World Financial Center. The World Financial Center is in the
18
             definition, I see. I don't know why. I guess DDC functioned
19
             there, so maybe that's why.
             MR. TYRRELL: One of the reasons is debris fell into those buildings, structural debris that was the same type
20
21
22
             that's being cleaned up on the ground fell over and went right
                                                                    Page 10
```

0

0

```
76FVWORC.TXT
23
24
                     into the Deutsche Bank building.
                    THE COURT: You know, I don't really care, except to the extent that the category is driving a different result from SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
                                                                                                             (212) 805-0300
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 22
                     76FVWORC
                                                                                                            Conference
                     that which we normally obtain. And I need to be alerted to that when it happens.
   2
   3
                                                    Why I challenge your leadership, Mr. Tyrrell, it's not
                    why I charlenge your leadership, Mr. Tyrrell, it's not because I don't admire your leadership. And I will tell you very candidly, although we've had our differences in these cases, one way that I've been able to administer the cases is because of the hard work that you and Mr. Hopkins and your other colleagues have put into this case. I'm indebted to you. And I have no doubt but that 102 and 103 will benefit from your
   4
   5
6
7
   8
10
                     leadership, as well
                   But what I'm bothered by is that as I look at these cases, DDC was not involved. And it should not be taken to task for providing masks or not providing masks, or giving education or not giving education. If that's the case, why are you involved? Why do you care, except as a friend of the Court. I'm glad to have your friendship, but there's a
11
12
13
15
16
17
                     conflict issue.
                    conflict issue.

MR. TYRRELL: I'll tell you why I care, and then I'll tell you why you shouldn't worry about it. Okay?

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. TYRRELL: First, I care because according to my colleagues over here, the City of New York in the 102 docket is currently in 65 to 95 actions. I am their counsel.

THE COURT: As owner?

MR. TYRRELL: We don't have the specific complaints SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300
18
19
20
21
22
 23
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  23
                     76FVWORC
                                                                                                             Conference
                    yet, but we assume so, yes. As either a tenant or an owner, yes, in 65 to 95 of those actions. And is in a whole bunch of actions that will be in that status in the 103 docket, as well.

THE COURT: By all means you have to be in the case,
   1
    2
    456789
                     but there have to be others.
                                                     MR. TYRRELL: We completely agree with that, let me
                     tell you the
                     THE COURT: No one is stepping up.

MR. TYRRELL: Well, that's the problem. But let me
tell you why you don't have to be concerned about the thing you
put in your order, which is the issue of conflict. Why?
Because when you serve as liaison counsel, the general law is
it isn't a conflict; your duty of loyalty still runs to your
client. You have a duty to the Court and everybody else to
10
11
 12
13
14
 15
                      serve as liaison --
                    THE COURT: I accept that, Mr. Tyrrell, as long as there are others in the group to protect different interests.

MR. TYRRELL: Couldn't agree with you more. But one last point, because I went and looked it up. You, very smartly, in the order you entered when you created liaison counsel, specifically said in CMO No. 2 way back when that there would be no conflicts by serving in that position.

So only the issue you have now addressed is the right issue, which is would some other people please step up so that there is a broad enough representation.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300
 16
 17
 18
 19
20
21
22
23
                                                                                                               (212) 805-0300
                                                                                                                Page 11
```

Ū

EXHIBIT H



The Legal Center One Riverfront Plaza 6th Floor Newark, NJ 07102 973-848-5600

973-848-5601 www.pationboggs.com

August 1, 2007

Via Electronic Mail

Hon. Alvin K. Hellerstein, U.S.D.J. United States District Court for the Southern District of New York 500 Pearl Street, Room 910 New York, New York 10007

Re: Kirk Arsenault, et al. v. Tully Construction Co., Inc., Tully Industries Inc., and Deutsche Bank, Docket No. 04-cv-5338 (AKH)

Dear Judge Hellerstein:

Counsel for the parties in the above-captioned action hereby submit this joint letter to request the Court's determination of the defendants' request to transfer this action from the 21 MC 102 docket to the 21 MC 100 docket,

Defendants' Position:

Counsel for Tully Construction Co. Inc. and Tully Industries, Inc. ("Tully") respectfully requests the transfer of the above-captioned action (the "Arsenault action") from the 21 MC 102 docket to the 21 MC 100 docket. Co-defendant Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas ("Deutsche Bank") does not object to Tully's request under the circumstances presented here.

Plaintiffs' counsel Robin Wertheimer, Esq. represents three plaintiffs in actions allegedly arising out of those plaintiffs' work allegedly related to the rescue, recovery and debris removal efforts following the collapse of the World Trade Center ("WTC") on September 11, 2001. Those plaintiffs are Kirk Arsenault, Steven Zablocki and Richard Racioppi. The latest version of the Arsenault complaint (filed October 13, 2004) (currently

pending in the 21 MC 102 docket) encompassed claims brought by two plaintiffs: Kirk Arsenault and Steven Zablocki. Mr. Zablocki's claims apparently were subsequently severed from the Arsenault action on December 26, 2006, when a separate individual complaint was filed in Mr. Zablocki's name under Civil Action No. 06-cv-15494 (the "Zablocki action"). The Zablocki action thereafter was docketed in 21 MC 100. Despite the apparent severance of Mr. Zablocki's claims from the Arsenault action, however, plaintiffs' counsel has not filed any amended pleading in the Arsenault action to reflect such severance. Furthermore, plaintiffs' counsel has failed to file a check-off complaint in the Arsenault action (notwithstanding the Court's prior order that check-off complaints for all actions in 21 MC 102 were to be filed by June 14, 2007).1

Plaintiffs' counsel Ms. Wertheimer previously wrote the Court to request the transfer of the Zablocki action from the 21 MC 100 docket to the 21 MC 102 docket. Defendants' counsel were never copied on plaintiffs' counsel's communication to the Court. Responding to plaintiffs' counsel's request, the Court ruled that the Zablocki action should "remain classified as related to 21 MC 100, and remain subject to the Second Circuit's stay." (April 13, 2007 Order Denying Motion to Transfer Dockets, Docket No. 06-cv-15494, 21 MC 100 (AKH)) (the "Zablocki Order"). Specifically, the Court indicated that plaintiff Zablocki's request to transfer his case from 21 MC 100 to 21 MC 102 was denied on the grounds that his complaint alleged that he worked at the Deutsche Bank building at 130 Liberty Street which is "considered part of the World Trade Center site, as defined in Case Management Order No. 3, 21 MC 100 (Feb. 7, 2005)."² The Court also denied plaintiff Zablocki's transfer request

The action of plaintiff Richard Racioppi, captioned Richard Racioppi v. Tully Construction Co., Inc., Tully Industries Inc., and Deutsche Bank, Index No. 112407/04 (latest complaint dated October 13, 2004), is not the subject of this joint letter as plaintiffs' counsel has indicated that the Racioppi action shortly will be voluntarily dismissed or withdrawn. If that understanding is incorrect in any way, then Tully respectfully requests, without objection from Deutsche Bank, that the Racioppi action also be transferred from the 21 MC 102 docket to the 21 MC 100 docket for the reasons set forth herein. Although the Racioppi action (like the Arsenault action) currently is docketed in 21 MC 102, no check-off complaint has been filed in the Racioppi action.

Deutsche Bank does not concede that the definition of the World Trade Center site in CMO 3 is necessarily dispositive of Tully's request. In Deutsche Bank's view, it is the nature of a given plaintiff's work, not just the location, that should dictate whether the case is designated to 21 MC 100 or 21 MC 102. However, the parties need not debate that issue in the present application because the type of work performed by Arsenault, Zablocki, and Racioppi, on behalf of a City contractor, militates in favor of their designation to 21 MC 100.

because defendant Tully is one of the contractors of the City of New York involved in the 21 MC 100 docket and is one of the contractors involved in the interlocutory appeal to the Second Circuit which resulted in a stay of all 21 MC 100 proceedings. See Zablocki Order.

Just like the Zablocki action, the Arsenault action belongs in the 21 MC 100 docket and should be transferred there and stayed. The allegations of plaintiff Arsenault are identical to those of plaintiff Zablocki. Compare Kirk Arsenault et. al. v. Tully Construction Co., Tully Industries Inc., and Deutsche Bank, Index No. 04 CV 5338 at ¶11, 14 ("Arsenault Complaint") with Steve Zablocki v. Tully Construction Co., Inc., Tully Industries Inc., and Deutsche Bank, Index No. 06-CV-15494 at ¶11, 14 ("Zablocki Complaint"). Plaintiffs' counsel has indicated that plaintiffs Arsenault and Zablocki worked side-by-side in the Deutsche Bank building. Both plaintiffs have brought suit against Tully and Deutsche Bank for the WTC-related work in which they allegedly were involved. Compare Arsenault Complaint at ¶4, 6, 40 with Zablocki Complaint at ¶4, 6, 45. And finally, both plaintiffs Arsenault and Racioppi allege that they were employed by Manfort Brothers Inc., a subcontractor of Tully, and worked doing debris removal and cleanup work in the Deutsche Bank building. Compare Arsenault Complaint at ¶11 with Zablocki Complaint at ¶11. Manfort Brothers, Inc. conducted this work as a subcontractor to Tully who was working as one of the City of New York's contractors in the rescue, recovery and debris removal effort.

Given the identical nature of the Arsenault and Zablocki claims and for the reasons already articulated by the Court in the Zablocki Order, Tully respectfully requests that the Arsenault action be transferred from the 21 MC 102 docket to the 21 MC 100 docket. Should the Court require that a formal motion be filed seeking this result, Tully respectfully requests the opportunity to promptly file such motion upon request of the Court. Although Tully is protected by a current stay from the Second Circuit, we respectfully request that the time to respond to the Master Complaint be extended with respect to Defendants during the pendency

And the allegations of plaintiff Racioppi are the same. See, e.g., Racioppi Complaint at ¶ 13, 16.

With plaintiff Racioppi. See id. at ¶ 16.

⁵ And Racioppi. See id. at ¶ 7.

⁶ And Racioppi. See id. at ¶ 13.

of this letter request to avoid prejudice should the Court disagree with respect to the relief requested herein.

Plaintiffs' Position:

Plaintiff Kirk Arsenault objects to the proposed transfer of his case from its present docket. The defendants' proposal is highly prejudicial and, under its own reasoning. entirely unfounded.

Plaintiffs Arsenault and Zablocki, working side by side, were employed by Manfort Brothers, a sub contractor of Tully, to dismantle the Deutsche Bank building at 130 Liberty Street in the aftermath of September 11. These men were employed in the fairly unique job of "burners" or, burning the steel of the building in such a way as to control its demolition. In the course of this employment, they were exposed to molds and other toxins which have caused them serious injuries. Their employ commenced on or about October 15, 2001.

In 2004, Arsenault and Zablocki brought one complaint under, inter alia, the labor law. It was filed in the Southern District on diversity grounds because these men reside in Massachusetts. As the docket illustrates, it was moved from Judge Kram, to Judge Cedarbaum to Judge Castel, then a pretrial conference was held before Judge Casey before it went to Judge Daniels, and it finally landed, despite plaintiffs' objections, with the World Trade Center cases. However, were it to be designated a World Trade Center case, it was more properly designated as an off-site case, in 21 MC 102.

The reasoning given by the defendants in this letter do not justify a reassignment of this case to the stayed docket. These plaintiffs' type of work does not in any way "militate on favor of their designation to the 21 MC 100 docket". The type of work that they did was not in any way "related to debris removal and clean up work". These quotes are from the defendants' portion of this letter in support of its reasoning. Should the type of work they did be a motivating factor in the reclassification, then defendants' argument must fail because, as mentioned above, their work was to dismantle a building more than a month after the disaster. (As we all know, that job was not completed; the building still stands.)

Plaintiff Zablocki was severed from the joint initial complaint pursuant to the Court's Order that all plaintiffs file separate complaints. Prior to his new complaint being filed, Zablocki had been docketed with Arsenault in 21 MC 102. In severing his complaint from Arsenault's, Zablocki ended up in the 21 MC 100 docket. At a 21 MC 102 conference before Judge Hellerstein, the undersigned requested the Court's guidance as to how to reunite these two plaintiffs in the 21 MC 102 docket. The instruction was to write to Judge Hellerstein and

Page 22 of 26

Hon. Alvin K. Hellerstein, U.S.D.J. August 1, 2007 Page 5

request that he direct the clerk of court to move Zablocki into the 21 MC 102 docket. Two such requests on behalf of Zablocki were denied.

Plaintiff Arsenault did file a check off complaint in the 21 MC 102 docket in a timely manner. Arsenault has been in the off site docket since its inception. It only makes sense that a worker who worked after October 15, 2001 in a job that entailed strictly demolition be in the 21 MC 102 docket. Defendants have waited until now to try to move this case to the stayed docket because of the error that was promulgated with the Zablocki case after his complaint was separately filed. Defendants have had years to request this transfer, but never did because there was no substance to this request prior to the severance and reassignment of the Zablocki matter.

Given the fact that there is a possibility of the stayed 21 MC 100 cases being dismissed by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, the prejudice to this plaintiff is immeasurable. As the defendants' portion of this letter suggests, the designations of these dockets are not immutable. In this letter, Tully does not agree with Deutsche Bank as to the definition of the World Trade Center site. But they both agree that the nature of the work has some weight. These defendants then proceed to mischaracterize the nature of the work performed by these plaintiffs as clean up and debris removal. Should this be a deciding factor. then it clearly does not support moving this plaintiff into a docket with such workers and their request must be denied. Furthermore, it seems highly prejudicial to move a plaintiff into a stayed docket at such a late date when the case has not been previously classified as such nor has this plaintiff been given the opportunity to make timely objections on his own behalf (with all respect to, and admiration for, the papers filed on behalf of the plaintiffs in the 21 MC 100 docket).

The request of the defendants to move Kirk Arsenault's case from its present place in the 21 MC 102 docket into the 21 MC 100 docket should be in all respects denied and as the request is based mostly on the reassignment of the Zablocki action, the Court is asked to reconsider its placement of the Zablocki action.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Weber, Esq. MOUND COTTON WOLLAN & GREENGRASS Counsel for Tully Construction Co. Inc., Tully Industries, Inc.

James E. Tyrrell, Jr., Esq. PATTON BOGGS LLP Counsel for Tully Construction Co. Inc., Tully Industries, Inc.

Marc D. Crowley, Esq. DAY PITNEY LLP Counsel for Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas

Robin S. Wertheimer WERTHEIMER ASSOCIATES, P.C. Counsel for Plaintiff Kirk Arsenault

EXHIBIT I

21 MC 102

In Re World Trade Center Lower Manhattan Disaster Site Litigation

07cv1552 07cv4445 07cv4446 07cv1554 05cv9821 05cv10135 07cv1556 04cv5338 07cv1460 07cv1562 07cv5336
07cv4446 07cv1554 05cv9821 05cv10135 07cv1556 04cv5338 07cv1460 07cv1562
07cv1554 05cv9821 05cv10135 07cv1556 04cv5338 07cv1460 07cv1562
05cv9821 05cv10135 07cv1556 04cv5338 07cv1460 07cv1562
05cv10135 07cv1556 04cv5338 07cv1460 07cv1562
07cv1556 04cv5338 07cv1460 07cv1562
04cv5338 07cv1460 07cv1562
07cv1460 07cv1562
07cv1562
07cv5336
* * * * *
07cv5550
07cv4453
07cv1473
06cv11968
07cv1575
07cv1578
07cv5280
07cv4459
07cv1580
05cv1718
07cv1589
06cv5631
07cv5394
07cv317
07cv4462
07cv1602
07cv5353
06cv14620
07cv1603
07cvl606
07cvl607
07cv4466
07cv1612
07cv5290
07cv1617
05cv10739
07cv1619
06cv11676
07cv5554
07cv4472
07cv5556
07cv4473
07cv5295
07cv1628
07cv1627
07cv1629
07cv1630 06cv14746

Plaintiff	Case Number
Marian Karus and Barbara Karus	07cv1635
Edward Kosowski	07cv5299
Ana Lascano	05cv9333
Andrzej Lasica and Ewelina Lasica	07cv4480
Carlos Lenis and Lucia Lenis	06cv10045
Ines Leon and Luis E. Quezada	07cv4481
Cesar Leon and Agnes Dipini	07cv63
Wilmo Loja	07cv4482
Fernando Lucero	07cv5366
Rosa Medina	07cv4491
Maria E. Melendez	07cv5397
Juan Mendez and Kareen Mendez	07cv1664
Carlos Merchan and Martha Merchan	07cv1665
Eugenic Mora and Olga Mora	06cv13168
Tatiana Morales and James Fink	07cv5370
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	07cv1670
Sandra Moreno	05cv10738
Luis Naranjo and Rosa Naranjo	
Walter Naranjo and Miriam Naranjo	07cv4496
Oscar Negrete	07cv5371
Sean O'Connell and Carole O'Connell	07cv5374
Rosa Palaguachi and Rigoberto	07cvl680
David Reynolds and Katherine Reynolds	07cv3446
Marcel Rhoden and Deirdre L. Worley	07cv5311
Maximo Riera and Fanny Riera	07cvl519
Patricio Rodas and Taina Ruiz	07cv1694
Jaime Rojas and Johanna Hernandez	07cv451I
Mieczyslaw Romaniuk	07cv5316
Victor Salazar	07cv4512
Rosa Sanchez and Hector Albarracih	06cv12488
Edilberto Sanchez	07cv5384
Emanuel Santamaria	07cv1528
Gala Sarmiento	07cv1529
Edwin Sarmiento and Nora Sarmiento	07cv4515
Teresa Serrano	05cv8937
Raul Siguencia	07cv1533
Felipe Suarez	07cv1707
Samuel Sumba and Mercedes Sumba	07cv1710
Pedro Tamayo and Gabriella Tamayo	07cv1538
Nicholas Teham	07cv5564
Julia Tenezaca	07cv1714
Cesareo Teran	07cv5389
Jeanne Thorpe	07cv1715
Carlos A. Valencia and Gloria N. Bonilla	07cv5324
Rommel Vasquez and Rosa A. Gomez	07cvl543
Kattia Vazquez and Peter Vazquez	07cvl722
Severo Vega and Lila Gonzalez	07cv4521
Segundo Villarroel and Martha L. Villarroel	07cv1546
Kleber Villarruel	06cvl3703
Kevin Walsh	06cv12608
Robert Waniurski and Ewa Waniurski	07cv4524
Ancil Watson	07cv5391
Clarence Wragg and Cecilia Wragg	06cv8125
Ciarence wragg and Cecina wragg	00070123